US HIGHWAY 89 CORRIDOR PLAN
DRAFT GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND EVALUATION CRITERIA*

GOAL I. MAINTAIN MOBILITY

Objective 1. Minimize congestion and travel delay.

Evaluation Criteria 1. LOS
Evaluation Criteria 2. Travel time or vehicle hours of travel (VHT).
Evaluation Criteria 3. Reduction in number of roadway segments and locations with traffic operations needs.

Objective 2. Facilitate freight movement through the design of facility improvements, highway access, and adjacent land uses.

Objective 3. Provide convenient linkages between transportation modes.

Objective 4. Maximize connectivity and directness of travel.

Objective 5. Improve travel reliability.

Objective 6. Consider impacts to the transportation system when reviewing land use plan amendments, rezones, and development proposals.

GOAL II. ENHANCE SAFETY

Objective 1. Design corridor transportation facilities to serve anticipated function and intended uses.

Objective 2. Enhance safety by prioritizing and mitigating existing or potential high accident locations within the corridor.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Reduction in number of high accident segments and locations.

Objective 3. Develop parallel pedestrian and bicycle routes that comply with ITD design standards where these facilities cannot reasonably be provided on US 89.

Objective 4. Maintain access management standards for US 89, consistent with ITD requirements, to reduce conflicts between vehicles and trucks and between vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Reduction in public and private access points.

Objective 5. Provide (by developer) safe vehicular and pedestrian access to US 89 from new development.

GOAL III. ENHANCE LIVABILITY

Objective 1. Protect and enhance the natural environment by avoiding or minimizing potential adverse impacts associated with transportation system development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Number of acres of wetlands or wildlife habitat disturbed or lost.

Objective 2. Avoid or minimize land use displacements associated with transportation system development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Number of potential displaced/encroached upon parcels by land use type.

Objective 3. Avoid or minimize impacts to historic, cultural, and institutional resources associated with transportation system development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Number of potential impacted parcels by type (direct/indirect) and degree of impact.

Objective 4. Avoid or minimize right-of-way needs associated with transportation system development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Right-of-way needs by land use type.

Objective 5. Promote transportation choices through the development of safe, attractive, and accessible pedestrian ways, bicycle ways, and multi-use paths according to ITD requirements.

Objective 6. Encourage mixed-use development to minimize vehicular trip generation, particularly in the Bear Lake area.

GOAL IV. MINIMIZE COST

Objective 1. Minimize capital cost of transportation facilities, including preservation of rights-of-way prior to project development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Estimated capital cost

Objective 2. Minimize transportation system user cost.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Travel time or vehicle hours of travel (VHT)

GOAL V. DISTRIBUTE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS EQUITABLY

Objective 1. *Develop transportation facilities which are accessible to all members of the community. In particular, construct facilities to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.*

Objective 2. Avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse effects of transportation system development on minority populations and low-income populations.

Notes:

1. All of the goals and objectives will be used to guide future management actions regarding the corridor. Not all of the objectives, however, are relevant for the evaluation of improvement options. These are shown in italics.
2. All of the evaluation criteria listed are measurable in terms of discrete quantities. For the objectives that do not have specific evaluation criteria listed, the criteria will be some type of rating reflecting how closely the improvement option meets the objective, such as "high, medium, and low".